

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-17 are pending. Claim 10 and 16 are the only independent claims. Claim 10 has been amended. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 16 is allowed.

Claims 10-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 6,466,202 (Suso et al) in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,358 (Narayanaswamy et al.). Applicants submit that amended independent claim 10 is patentable for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 10 recites, inter alia, that the smaller second display and the common display driver are mounted on one side of a substrate, while the larger first display is mounted on the other side of the same substrate. This feature is supported at least by Figure 7 and the specification at page 12, lines 1-15. As discussed in the specification, this layout is particularly advantageous in allowing the surface area of the substrate to be utilized uniformly, with less unused area.


Suso shows a mobile terminal unit having first and second displays. Narayanaswamy et al. was cited as teaching a common display driver. However, neither Suso nor Narayanaswamy et al. teach or suggest the feature of amended claim 10 by which the smaller second display and the common display driver are mounted on one side of a substrate, while the larger first display is mounted on the other side of the same substrate. For at least this reason, amended claim 10 is believed patentable over the cited art.

The other claims are ultimately dependent on independent claim 10 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as that claim.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant